



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2005

Mr. John S. Aldridge
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2005-00878

Dear Mr. Aldridge:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 217886.

The Florence Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received three requests for information concerning a named district teacher and a copy of the district's teacher handbook. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. The information submitted as Attachment 6 consists of the named teacher's I-9 form and an attachment to the form. The federal Employment Eligibility Verification, Form I-9 is governed by section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code, which provides that an I-9 form and "any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter" and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the I-9 form in this instance would be "for purposes other than for enforcement" of the referenced federal statutes. Accordingly, we determine that the I-9 form and attached document in Attachment 6 are confidential and may only be released in compliance with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system.¹

¹ Based on this finding, we do not reach your claim under section 552.130 for this information.

Next, you contend that the information submitted as Attachment 7 is excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides, "A document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." This office interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that opinion, this office also determined that a teacher is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* Based on your representations and the reasoning set out in Open Records Decision No. 643, we find that the professional development and appraisal documents in Attachment 7 are confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information in Attachment 7 pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Finally, you contend that the information in Attachment 8 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) excepts from disclosure information protected by the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body.² TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.³ TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a

² The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

³ Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); *see also id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining "representative of the client," "representative of the lawyer").

communication that was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

As you acknowledge, Attachment 8 consists of e-mails between the named teacher at issue and her attorney, which the teacher forwarded to her principal. While you contend that the e-mails “contain advice from the teacher’s attorney to her,” you have not explained how the e-mails at issue constitute privileged communications between the district and an attorney representing the district. Further, you have not explained how the e-mails constitute privileged communications between representatives of the district, where the district is the “client” for purposes of the privilege. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(a)(2) (defining “representative of the client” as person having authority to obtain legal services or to act on legal advice on behalf of client, or person who for purpose of effectuating legal representation makes or receives a confidential communication while acting in scope of employment for client). We therefore find the district has not met its burden of establishing that the e-mails are protected by the attorney-client privilege. Accordingly, we determine that the district may not withhold Attachment 8 pursuant to the attorney-client privilege.

We note, however, that Attachment 8 contains the teacher’s personal e-mail address. Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the person at issue consents to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Thus, unless the teacher has consented to its release, we determine that the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked in Attachment 8 pursuant to section 552.137(a).

In summary, the district must withhold the I-9 form and attached document submitted as Attachment 6 pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. The district must withhold the information in Attachment 7 pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. We have marked

an e-mail address in Attachment 8 that must be withheld under 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge

this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Saldivar', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 217886

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tiffany Wells
P.O. Box 697
Florence, Texas 76527
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Currie
Texas Classroom Teachers Association
P.O. Box 1489
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)